Ageing and Decision-making: A systematic review and meta-analysis

*Nicole Ee[a,b,c,e], BSc(Psych)/LLB, ORCID: 0000-0002-4561-4204

Brooke Brady[a,b,c], PhD, ORCID: 0000-0002-6084-5027

Craig Sinclair[a,b,c], PhD, ORCID: 0000-0003-2734-2951

Kaarin J. Anstey[a,b,c], PhD, ORCID: 0000-0002-9706-9316

Ruth Peters[a,e], PhD, ORCID: 0000-0003-0148-3617

a. School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
b. Neuroscience Research Australia, Sydney, Australia
c. UNSW Ageing Futures Institute, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
d. The George Institute for Global Health, Australia

***Corresponding author**:

Nicole Ee

Email: n.ee@unsw.edu.au

Tel: +61 430 910 661

Number of Tables: 2

Number of Figures: 1

Word count: 4139 (excluding tables and references)

Key words: cognition, cognitive ageing, decision-making, older adults

Funding: This work was supported by a grant from the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence in Population Ageing Research.

Abstract

Objectives

This systematic review aimed to synthesise the evidence on potential differences in financial, social, health and safety-related decision-making between younger and older adults.

Methods

Trial, experimental, and prospective studies including older (60+) and younger adults that reported on quantitative decision-making outcome measures (i.e., performance in relation to achieving a specific prespecified goal) were included.

Results

Decision-making was significantly poorer (i.e., further from prespecified goals) in older compared to younger adults (k = 57, d_{random} = -0.17, 95% CI -0.29, -0.04, I^2 = 92.92%), with high heterogeneity between studies. Age differences were observed for financial and social but not health decision-making domains.

Discussion

Older adults performed more ‘poorly’ on financial and social decision-making than younger adults. Reasons for observed differences may vary (e.g., different motivation and values) and require exploration in future research. This has implications for how people of different ages are supported, especially at times of important decision-making.

Introduction

Decision-making refers to the cognitive processes that result in a final belief, choice, or course of action (Wang and Ruhe 2007). It is integral to daily life and to successful ageing. Since decision-making is influenced by multiple factors including performance in cognitive domains that are thought to change with ageing (e.g., learning, memory, information processing speed) it has been suggested that decision-making performance may change with increasing age (Del Missier et al. 2020; Lim and Yu 2015; Phillips et al. 2016). However, the degree, directionality, and implications of this remain unclear (Bruine de Bruin et al. 2012; E. Peters et al. 2007). Older age has also been associated with positive decision-making tendencies such as a reduced influence of irrelevant options on final choice (Kim and Hasher 2005) and avoidance of sunk cost bias (e.g., the tendency to continue investments with poor return) (Bruine de Bruin et al. 2007; Strough et al. 2008). Conversely, negative associations between age and decision-making have also been observed, including inconsistent application of decision rules (Bruine de Bruin et al. 2007), worse decision-making with increasing options (Besedeš et al. 2012) and susceptibility to framing effects (Bruine de Bruin et al. 2007; Finucane et al. 2005). Alongside this there is a growing awareness of the factors that might impact upon decision-making and the need to take this into account in a societal setting (Fontaine et al. 2021; Weissberger et al. 2021).

Increasing attention is also being paid to capacity assessments and the development of frameworks for assisted and supported decision-making in clinical populations (Moye et al. 2006). Understanding this potential change in decision-making with age is important in the context of our ageing populations. Building upon this knowledge will be critical to developing appropriate and well-targeted information, interventions, and policies for adults at different stages of life. Whilst the assessment of this is complex and there are multiple factors that might impact on decision-making, (Kusev et al. 2017; Lerner et al. 2015) the use

of experimental decision-making tasks allows a level of standardisation in this area and the potential to examine age effects or to compare performance at different ages on the same or similar standard tasks. Furthermore, experimental decision-making studies provide important insights into the possible mechanisms underpinning age differences in cognitive task performance (Pachur et al. 2017). In particular tasks that enable proxy measurement of the mental processes underpinning real-world decision-making and instrumental activities of daily living and the assessment of decision-making under conditions simulating those that would likely accompany real-world financial, social, health and safety decisions (e.g., risk and uncertainty), given relevant goals (e.g., increasing monetary profit, social benefit). For example, the widely used Iowa Gambling Task (IGT), measures how averse or inclined individuals are to risk using a card game involving selecting cards from one of four decks. Two of the decks either yield a penalty ($100) or high monetary reward ($250) and the other two decks are low risk ($50 deduction) low reward ($50). Participants are instructed to maximise their winnings over multiple selections. Examples of other well-known and widely used tasks include the Ultimatum game (UG), which assesses generosity and reciprocity through participants deciding how to split a monetary sum between themselves and another person and the game of dice task which requires participants to predict a dice roll through selecting high risk high reward or low risk low reward odds (full details in Online Resource: Supplementary Table VI).

Several reviews target ageing and decision-making, but few have adhered to systematic review methodology or have drawn existing data together quantitatively. Three have been systematic with the most recent published in 2015 (Best and Charness 2015; Mata et al. 2011; Thornton and Dumke 2005). Thornton and Dumke (2005) explored age differences in everyday problem solving and decision-making in 28 studies published until 2003. The authors observed a reliable deterioration of everyday problem-solving and

decision-making effectiveness with older age. Mata et al. (2011) explored age differences in risky decision-making, including an exploration of framing effects. They reported no overall or framing differences between younger and older adults on risky moral and financial decision-making. More recently, Best and Charness included publications until 2013 and found younger adults were more likely to make risky decisions in positively framed (but not negatively framed) conditions (Best and Charness 2015). Moderator analysis revealed age differences were exclusive to small-reward financial and large-reward morality scenarios in positively framed conditions. Both reviews highlighted the potential impact of task characteristics on age-related decision-making. Overall, these reviews provide inconsistent evidence for age-related variability in decision-making and serve to highlight important gaps in the extant literature. These include limited generalisability of current evidence due to an underrepresentation of studies on non-risky decision-making or decisions in real-world contexts (e.g., financial decision-making, health, and safety decision-making), the need for consideration of potential moderators (such as task characteristics, demographic factors) in research design and interpretation of results, and where possible, appropriate statistical analyses accounting for these factors.

To address current knowledge gaps and improve translatability of available research, an updated, comprehensive review is required. The primary aim of this review was to synthesise the trial, experimental and prospective evidence for the impact of adult ageing on decision-making with applicability to real world outcomes and in key domains, including financial, social, health and safety-related decisions. The secondary aim of this review was to explore if task characteristics influence observed effects.

Method

Three databases, Embase, Medline and PsycINFO, were searched from inception to 18 January 2019, using the following search terms: (exp *ageing/ or exp *cognitive ageing)

AND (exp *decision-making/ OR cognitive ageing) supplemented with an additional targeted search in title, abstract and keyword fields (((ageing OR ageing) AND cognitive) AND (decision making OR decision)). Reference lists of reviews on ageing and decision-making were manually searched and field experts consulted to identify additional publications. Non-English publications were translated using the Google Translate web-based software.

Study Selection

Two independent reviewers (NE and RP) carried out title and abstract screening for all publications returned by the searches and identified through reference lists followed by subsequent full text screening. Discrepancies in study selection were resolved through discussion and consensus at both stages.

Eligibility Criteria and Rationale

To capture the widest possible evidence, liberal eligibility criteria were used. Experimental, observational studies, and trials including older adults aged over 60 years and reporting on the relationship between decision-making and age were included. Studies reporting on age-related changes in adulthood (within-subject comparison) or age-related differences between a younger and older adult group (between-subjects comparison) were included. Studies of only paediatric, adolescent, animal or clinical populations were excluded. We also chose to focus on published original research and excluded editorials, commentaries, reviews, dissertation, and conference abstracts.

The literature covers a wide range of studies exploring age differences in decision-making outcomes, tendencies, and underlying mechanisms, but many do not allow for the determination of whether older age is associated with better or worse overall decisions making. While real-world decisions are often incredibly nuanced and multifaceted, in balance, better outcomes generally are those that result in better financial standing, are socially favourable e.g., more altruistic, improve health and safety, or avoid physical harm

and damage or emotional distress. In these terms, this review specifically focuses on evidence relating to whether older adults are likely to be worse real-world decision-makers than their younger counter parts. To ensure applicability to real world outcomes, only studies where decisions could be quantified as positive or negative in relation to a task-specific goal were included. These primarily comprised of decision-making tasks which resulted in a final amount of points or money earned or lost. Studies exclusively investigating neutral decision response tendencies (i.e., preferencing certain options over others e.g., colour or brand preference; informational presentation type) were excluded. For example, studies investigating older adults' car colour preferences would be excluded, as there is no way to ascertain whether choosing a blue over a red car is indicative of superior decision-making. Conversely, studies investigating older adults' decisions to purchase a car based on set of constraints or goals would be included, as some car choices would take them closer to the goal parameters for the task than others.

Eligible studies were included in meta-analyses if they reported effect sizes in the form of correlation coefficients (Pearson's *r*, Spearman's ρ), unstandardised regression coefficients (β), Cohen's *d*, or provided sufficient data (e.g., means and standard deviations, *t* or *F* statistics, Chi-squared tests, Mann-Whitney U tests, two-way ANOVA) to calculate Cohen's *d*. Where multiple publications were derived from the same dataset, the most comprehensive data was included to eliminate duplication.

Data Extraction

Data were extracted by a team of four reviewers (NE, RP, CS, BB) into an *a priori* study extraction table. All the entries were then checked by a second reviewer, identified errors were corrected and checked by a third reviewer against the original publication. Data was collected on study name, publication year, sample size, mean age and standard deviation, proportion female, decision-making task and domain, type of statistical analyses, control

variables, and a summary of results. If multiple age comparisons were reported, the older (aged 60+) versus younger (aged 30-60) comparisons were preferentially extracted. The classification of performance as better/poorer was based on the classification reported in the constituent studies and the prespecified goals that the studies used in their experimental decision-making tasks. Where a significant relationship between age and decision-making was reported, any secondary analyses investigating potential mechanisms were also extracted. Multiple studies within a single publication were numbered for differentiation, and publications with overlapping data sources were identified and labelled. Data on effect size were extracted. Unstandardised regression coefficients (β) (Borenstein et al. 2011) and Spearman's rank correlations (ρ) corresponding to large sample sizes were directly substituted as *r* statistics. Imputing missing correlations with β and ρ have been found to produce relatively accurate and precise population-effects estimates, while also reducing sampling bias within meta-analyses (Peterson and Brown 2005; Rupinski and Dunlap 1996). Average effect sizes were calculated for studies reporting multiple conditions of the same task (e.g., gains and loss conditions, familiar and non-familiar conditions) to ascertain the overall age effects. Effect size direction was standardised such that a negative effect size represented poorer decision-making as a function of increasing age. Multiple rows of data were extracted if the same participants performed more than one decision-making task, and a weighted average effect size computed for tasks of the same decision-making domain. Each outcome was coded for study characteristics including decision-making tasks (Iowa Gambling Task (IGT), Ultimatum Game (UG), Game of Dice Task (GDT), Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART), other), decision-making domain (financial, social, health, safety, other), additional task demands (altruism, risk, intertemporal judgement, inferencing, or exploration/exploitation factors), and independent age variable (categorical/continuous).

Meta-analysis

Meta-analysis was performed with Jamovi MAJOR, with Correlations Coefficients, and variance for age effects on decision-making outcomes as the principal outcome variable. Due to variability in sampling characteristics and methodology of included studies, random effects Restricted Maximum Likelihood models were employed. Heterogeneity of outcomes was quantified with the I^2 index, funnel plots and summary effect size confidence intervals, with values closer to 100 per cent and a wider interval indicating greater heterogeneity, respectively (Borenstein et al. 2010; Borenstein et al. 2017; Sterne and Egger 2001) (Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. II)

Meta-analyses were carried out pooling all compatible studies, and, where possible by subgroup of decision-making domain (i.e., financial, social, health, safety). The risk of overestimation of effect sizes from small samples sizes ($N < 50$) associated with use of Cohen's d was examined with post-hoc sensitivity analyses. Sensitivity analyses were performed with Jamovi MAJOR. These assessed the potential impact of moderators on the relationship between age and decision-making (publication year, mean age, task type, presence of additional task demands), whether age was measured as a categorical or continuous variable, adjustment for socio-economic factors, and effect size conversion.

Risk of Bias Assessment

The review team developed a quality rating tool informed by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council's Guidelines for Assessing Risk of Bias (National Health and Medical Research Council, 2019). The quality rating tool contained 11 items which critically appraised risk of bias in five assessment domains: Selection bias (age range, sex distribution, sample size, screening), confounding bias (task administration), attrition bias, statistical analyses (appropriateness, adjustment for confounding effects), study design (suitability, clear description) (detailed in Online Resource: Supplementary Table III and IV).

Level of bias was rated low, moderate, or high for each item and overall risk of bias for the body of evidence summarised as a percentage of items rated low, moderate, or high bias per domain. A numerical scoring scheme was not employed as this can lead to a loss of subtlety when assessing quality (Jüni et al. 1999). Each study was assessed by two independent reviewers (NE, RP, CS, BB). Any discrepancies between bias ratings were resolved by discussion and consensus. The systematic review is reported in accordance with the PRISMA checklist (Online Resource: Supplementary Table V).

Results

A total of 1591 abstracts were screened from the first search and 467 from the second, with 213 publications assessed at the full text stage (Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. I). One hundred and thirty-seven full texts were deemed ineligible for reasons provided in Online Resource: Supplementary Table I. A final 76 publications containing 87 studies met the review eligibility criteria. Thirty-eight per cent of the included publications were published within the last five years, and 75 per cent within the last decade. Sample sizes were reasonable across studies, with only 10 of the 87 studies reporting small sample sizes ($N < 50$). The mean sample ages ranged from 18.7 to 83.5, and most studies included both male and female participants, albeit in different proportions (Table I shows the characteristics of the included studies).

Most studies employed tasks that involved financial decision-making ($k = 36$). There were limited numbers of studies with tasks representing social ($k = 14$), health ($k = 5$), and safety ($k = 4$) decision-making processes. Twenty-five studies employed tasks that did not fall into financial, social, health or safety domains. Twenty-eight studies involved tasks covering two or more decision-making domains (e.g., financial and social).

Table II shows the results and analyses in detail. Overall, the majority of the 87 studies found that older age was associated with poorer decision-making on one or more

outcome measure. Twenty-two studies reported no significant associations between age and decision-making, and 16 reported better decision-making amongst older as compared to younger adults on one or more measures. Three studies provided narrative summaries of overall age differences without numerical results, preventing their inclusion into meta-analysis (Cavanagh et al. 2012; Hess et al. 2012; Ma and Chen 2015). The relationship between age and decision-making was primarily investigated using a between-subjects design, with only two studies reporting on intra-individual age-related changes in decision-making (Bauer et al. 2013; Boyle, Yu, Buchman, et al. 2012; Li et al. 2013; Li et al. 2015). A total of 57 studies from 53 publications were compatible for meta-analyses and the data were pooled to allow for estimates of age differences on decision-making tasks.

Table I

Summary Characteristics of Included Studies

Reference	n(YA)	n(OA)	Female YA	Female OA	M Age (SD) YA	M Age (SD) OA	Task, outcome
Bailey, Ruffman and Rendell 2013	35	34	51.0%	71.0%	21.3 (3.1)	73.9 (7.14)	UG, responder UG, proposer
Bakos et al. 2008	10	10	90.0%	90.0%	62 (2.1)	80 (3.3)	IGT
Bangma et al. 2017	180		57.2%		49.6 (18.4)		IGT CDR
Bauer et al. 2013 (Denburg 2009 sample)	265		Sex stratified		59.10 (16.71) .		IGT, A'B'C'D' score (higher monetary gain) IGT, E'F'G'H' score (lower monetary loss)
Beadle et al. 2012	40	40	62.5%	57.5%	30.8 (6.6)	66.2 (7.6)	UG, payoff ratio UG, prosocial behaviour
Besedes et al. 2012b	Age Quartiles = 17, 17, 15, 16		73.8%		.	.	Multi-attribute decision problems requiring selection of option which includes given attribute
Best and Freund 2018	130		67.07%		45.2		48 decisions in risky framing decision task
Blanco et al. 2016 (1)	58	52	60.3%	59.6%	21.8	67.02 (5.1)	Leapfrog task (in lab)
Blanco et al. 2016 (2)	139	137	.	.			Remote completion of Leapfrog task
Boyle, Yu, Buchman, et al 2012	606		74.6%		82.4 (7.5)		12-item DM Competence Assessment Tool on

(RUSH sample)							healthcare and financial DM
Boyle, Yu, Wilson, et al 2012 (RUSH sample)	420		76.0%		83.5 (7.4)		12-item DM Competence Assessment Tool on healthcare and financial DM, overall score
							5-item self-report measure, susceptibility to scams
Brand and Schiebener 2013	538		51.0%		40.3 (16.7)		GDT
	221		53.4%		39.6 (16.5)		IGT
Bruine de Bruin, Strough and Parker 2014	335		58.5%		54.0 (13.8)		Sunk cost scenarios with large or small irrecoverable losses
Caird et al. 2005	Age Quartiles = 16, 16, 16, 14		50.0%, 50.0%, 50.0%, 57.1%		21.8 (2.1)	69.3 (2.2)	Modified Flicker Method (intersection turn DM)
					38.8 (13.8)	78.4 (3.8)	
Carvalho et al. 2012	40	40	55.0%	75.0%	25.5 (4.7)	67.4 (5.0)	IGT
Cassimiro et al. 2017	164		100.0%		.		IGT
Cavanagh et al. 2012	23	29	52.2%	75.9%	21	73	BART, amount of money acquired
Chung, Tymula and Glimcher 2017	39		35.9%		72.4		Behavioural paradigm measuring economic irrationality
Cooper et al. 2017 (1)	22	21	.	.	23.5 (4.0)	67.6 (6.4)	Adapted exploratory DM task
Cooper et al. 2017 (2)	110	111	.	.	25.9	64.5	Adapted exploratory DM task from

					(2.9)	(4.6)	
Cooper et al. 2013	47	42	.	.	.	67.4	Hypothetical scenario of testing two oxygen extraction systems on Mars with the goal of collecting enough oxygen to sustain life.
Cooper, Worthy and Maddox 2016	75	58	.	.	20.3 (2.3)	67.2 (5.3)	DM task - deck selection with goal of maximising total
Deakin et al. 2004	41	45	29.0%	51.0%	.	.	Decision-Gamble Task
	46	45	54.0%	27.0%			
Denburg et al. 2009	73	79	63.0%	63.0%	48.6 (11.9)	74.0 (5.6)	IGT
Denburg et al. 2007 (1)	80		50.0%	53.0%	41.0	70.4	IGT
Denburg et al. 2007 (2) (Includes Denburg et al. 2007 (1) sample)	20	29	.	.	.	.	Advertising study with deceptive vs nondeceptive claims
Denburg, Travel and Bechara 2005	80		50.0%	50.0%	.		Gambling task (Similar to IGT)
Di Rosa et al. 2017	21	15	47.6%	66.7%	42.5 (19.0)	63.1 (7.5)	IGT
Eberhardt, de Bruin and Strough 2019	926		51.2%		48.3 (15.9)		Resistance to sunk costs task and credit card repayment task.
Eppinger, Heekeren and Li 2017	25	25	48.0%	52.0%	24.8 (2.5)	71.2 (5.6)	A delay discounting task with small immediate rewards and large delayed reward
Fein, McGillivray and Finn 2007	112	52	56.3%	65.4%	37.8	73.7	IGT

					(10.7)	(7.4)	
Fernandes et al. 2019	YA = 30 MA = 30	29	YA = 50.0% MA = 55.3%	62.1%	YA = 26.6 (4.0) MA = 48.3 (5.5)	64.5 (4.1)	UG
Girardi, Sala and MacPherson 2018	22	30	86.4%	70.0%	19.6 (1.6)	69.7(6.6)	UG
Harle and Sanfey 2012	18	20	55.6%	65.0%	22.4	64.1	UG
Henninger, Madden and Huettel 2010	58	54	47.0%	50.0%	23.4 (4.4)	70.7 (3.0)	IGT (higher quality decisions associated with lower risk) CGT (higher quality decisions associated with lower risk) BART (higher quality decisions associated with higher risk)
Hess et al. 2018 (1)	96	97	53.1%	53.6%	32.2 (6.4)	74.4 (5.7)	DM task with low/high risk bet options over 60 trials, overall winnings DM task with low/high risk bet options over 60 trials, optimal Choice
Hess et al. 2018 (2)	63	60	55.6%	50.0%	32.2	74.4	DM task with low/high risk bet options over 60 trials,

					(6.4)	(5.7)	but with overweighting of small probabilities
Hess, Queen and Patterson 2012	54	55	.	.	.	.	2 Everyday DM tasks - choosing which grocery store to shop at/which apartment to buy
Huang et al. 2015	65	65	64.6%	72.3%	24.5 (3.8)	75.3(6.4)	IGT and CCT, combined standardised scores IGT
James et al. 2012 (RUSH sample)	525		76.0%		.	82.6 (6.7)	12-item version of the DM Competence Assessment tool
Jimura et al. 2011	20	20	.	.	.	.	Immediate/delayed monetary rewards DM task
Koscienlniak 2016	81	77	100.0%	100.0%	19.9 (1.0)	69.2 (4.3)	BART
Li et al. 2017	40	60	57.5%	63.3%	28.8 (5.4)	76.2 (6.5)	BART (higher quality decisions associated with higher risk)
Li et al. 2013	173	163	67.1%	64.4%	24.8 (2.9)	66.39 (4.9)	Temporal discounting task
Li et al. 2015	478		59.3%		46.6		2 Financial DM task, credit scores 2 Financial DM task, optimal health/credit repayment plan
Lobjos and Cavallo 2007	26	OA = 26 Older-OA = 26	50.0%	OA = 50.0% Older-OA =	.		Road crossing decision task with time constraint and without

				50.0%			
Lockenhoff et al. 2016 (1)	30	30	50.0%	50.0%	28.9 (4.8)	65.0 (8.5)	Dread sensitivity choice paradigm (electrodermal shock)
Lockenhoff et al. 2016 (2)	122		52.0%		50.0 (17.4)		Dread sensitivity choice paradigm (hypothetical)
Ma and Chen 2015	40	40	55.0%	65.0%	19.7 (1.6)	71.0(8.2)	Car purchasing task
MacPherson, Phillips and Sala 2002	YA = 30 MA = 30	29	YA = 50.0% MA = 50.0%	50.0%	YA = 28.8 (6.0) MA = 50.3 (5.7)	69.9 (5.5)	Gambling tasks using card selection
Mata, Schooler and Rieskamp 2007	83	83	49.4%	59.0%	24 (3.3)	71 (4.9)	Inference task on which diamonds was more expensive
Mata, von Helversen and Rieskamp 2010	50	50	54.0%	58.0%	24.1 (3.9)	69.0 (3.6)	Bespoke probabilistic inference task - decisions about profitability of stocks in a year's time on the basis characteristics
Mikels et al. 2013	30	30	63.0%	70.0%	20.6 (3.1)	75.0 (6.0)	Ratio bias paradigm
Mikels et al. 2010	60	60	48.0%	48.0%	22.6 (3.0)	72.4 (5.1)	Hypothetical choices amongst health care plans, physicians, medical treatments, homecare aids

Pachur, Mata and Hertwig 2017	60	62	76.7%	50.0%	23.6 (3.1)	71.3 (6.4)	Gain, loss, and mixed-domain choice problems
Pachur et al. 2009 (1)	40	40	60.0%	37.5%	25.3	71.0	Inference task (judgments in environment with low/high recognition)
Pachur et al. 2009 (2)	60	60	55.0wa%	58.3%	24.2	69.7	Inference task (judgements environment with low recognition validity) and additional estimation task.
Pertl et al. 2017	18	19	.	.	.	.	Real life DM task containing 12 short test problems in health context
Queen and Hess 2010	62	75	46.8%	50.7%	19.4 (2.0)	71.0 (5.9)	Two decision contexts (choosing and apartment/bank)
Rieger and Mata 2013	707		10.0%		53 (15)		Risk game (measuring amount invested in risky option)
	696		.		.		Dictator game (decision to donate money to others) Public goods game (decision to contribute to public good)
Roalf et al. 2012	29	30	48.0%	50.0%	30.2 (5.5)	71.3 (4.4)	UG Delay discounting task Dictator game (decision on amount of endowment to keep or give away to unknown partner)
Rogalsky et al. 2012	15		60.0%		77		IGT
Rolison, Hanoch and Wood 2012	40	44	.	.	19.3	76.6	BART

					(1.8)	(5.9)	
Rolison, Wood and Hanoch 2017 (1)	39	39	46.0%	61.0%	23.2	72.6	Vignette judgements on health, fraud, and weather (with audio informational updates) assessing posterior DM
Rolison, Wood and Hanoch 2017 (2)	40	40	55.0%	60.0%	21.8	73.9	Vignette judgements on health, fraud, and weather (with audio and written informational updates) assessing posterior DM
Rosen, Brand and Kalbe 2016	197		61.9%		45.9 (18.4)		Moral DM task (decision between altruistic and egoistic choice
Rutledge et al. 2016	25189 (of which 931 OA)		.		.		The Great Britain experiment
Rydzewska et al. 2018 (1)	52	52	67.3%	69.2%	23.4 (2.6)	68.2 (3.5)	Sequential DM task, requiring participants to choose cheapest offer
Rydzewska et al. 2018 (2)	64	64	64.1%	62.5%	23.0 (2.5)	69.4 (3.2)	Sequential DM task, requiring participants to choose cheapest, with short/long optimal search times
Schiebener and Brand 2017 (Includes Brand and Schiebener 2013 sample)	42 42 42 42	42	35.7% 40.5% 45.2% 52.4% 38.1%	61.9%	22.9 (2.8) 33.6 (2.8) 44.7 (3.1)	67.45 (5.9)	IGT GDT

					54.2 (2.6)		
Seaman et al. 2018	75		56.0%		49.7 (17.9)		Effort expenditure reward task, physical effort vs monetary reward Probability discounting DM paradigm Temporal discounting task
Seaman et al. 2016	92		59.8%		49.6		Mixed discounting task, overall score
	YA = 31 MA = 31	30	YA = 58.8% MA = 61.3%	63.3%	YA = 28.8 (5.0) MA = 50.6 (6.5)	70.2 (6.7)	Temporal discounting with money, social and health reward Probability discounting with money, social and health reward Effort discounting with money, social and health reward
Sparrow and Spaniol 2018 (1)	32	30	62.0%	63.0%	25.3 (5.2)	70.6 (4.9)	Bespoke intertemporal financial choice (higher score indicated choices which maximised earnings)
Sparrow and Spaniol 2018 (2)	31	23	61.0%	61.0%	20.8 (2.7)	71.4 (7.0)	Online bespoke intertemporal financial choice task
Stewart et al. 2018 (RUSH Sample)	937		76.4%		81.2 (7.6)		Modified 12-Item version of well-validated healthcare and financial DM measure
Strough et al. 2016	397		60.8%		47.1 (15.0)		Sunk cost scenarios with large or small irrecoverable losses

Tymula et al. 2013	(Adolescents = 33) YA = 34 MA = 32	36	(Adolescents = 51.2%) YA = 52.9% MA = 53.1%	50.0%	.		Computerised monetary choice task with option to lose/gain fixed amount or lottery
Von Helversen and Mata 2012	32	32	56.3%	53.1%	24.2 (2.7)	69.0 (3.5)	Sequential DM task in the form of a computerised shopping task
Walker, Fisk and Mcguire 1997	33	30	.	.	19.7 (1.5)	71.6 (4.6)	Simulated route selection interface with traffic information
Wayde et al. 2017	55	46	.	.	18.7 (1.5)	73.8 (8.1)	Purchasing choice task with varying product familiarity
Wood et al. 2005	88	67	75.0%	74.6%	22.1 (4.5)	77.3 (4.6)	IGT
Wood et al. 2011	121		60.3%		55.7 (23.9)		DM scenario requiring choice of drug plan according to lower annual cost
Worthy et al. 2014	91	91	.	.	22.5	67.6	Dynamic DM task with increasing and decreasing conditions and 2/4 choice optimising rewards task
Worthy et al. 2016	18	18	55.6%	44.4%	23.6	67	2 option state-based dynamic DM task where current rewards depended on past choices

Worthy et al. 2011 (1)	28	28	64.3%	67.9%	20.3	68.6	Choice independent DM task
Worthy et al. 2011 (2)	51	52	.	.	20.4	67.5	Choice-dependent DM task
Zamarian et al. 2008	33	52	66.7%	65.4%	36.1	69.3	IGT
					(13.7)	(7.0)	PAG

[a]Abbreviations as follows: DM, decision-making; YA, younger adult group; OA, older adult group; MA, middle-aged adult group; BART, Balloon Analogue Risk Task; CDR, Competence in Decision Rules; CGT, Cambridge Gambling Task; GDT, Game of Dice task; IGT, Iowa Gambling Task; PAG, Probability-Associated Gambling Task; UG, Ultimatum Game.

[b]For a summary of key decision making tasks see Online Resource: Supplementary Table VII.

Table II

Summary of results and analyses of included studies

Reference	Analysis	Adjustments/Controls		Age effect	DM domain
Bailey, Ruffman and Rendell 2013	2x2x2 ANOVA	.	Main effect of age rejection rates: $F(1,67) = 0.52$, $p = .47$, $\eta p2 = 0.01$.	ns	F
	2x2 ANOVA	.	Main effect of age generosity in offer: $F(1,67) = 5.42$, $p < .05$, $\eta p2 = 0.08$	+	SO/F
Bakos et al. 2008	Independent samples t-test	.	$t(18) = 3.34$, $p = .04$, $d = 1.52$	-	F
	Regression		$\beta = -0.65$, $t(18) = -3.67$, $p < .01$	-	
Bangma et al. 2017	Hierarchical regression	Control variables education, income, employment status, gender.	IGT net score, $b = -0.62$, $\Delta R2 = 0.071$, $p(\Delta F) < .001$	-	F
	Hierarchical regression	Education included as main predictor. Control variables education, income, employment status, gender.	Competence in decision rules, $b = -0.07$, $\Delta R2 = 0.15$, $p(\Delta F) < .001$	-	F
Bauer et al. 2013 (Denburg 2009 sample)	Linear regression	Covariates demographic and neuropsychological variables.	Lower immediate reward/delayed punishment condition, unstandardised β coefficient $= -0.32$, $t(263) = -2.59$, $p = .01$	-	F
	Correlation		$r = -0.16$, ns	ns	

	Linear regression Linear regression Correlation	Covariates demographic and neuropsychological variables	Higher immediate reward/delayed punishment condition, unstandardised β coefficient = −0.16, t(263) = −1.19, p = .24 r = -0.07, ns	ns ns	F
Beadle et al. 2012	Repeated measures 2x2x2 ANOVA Post-hoc t-test	.	Main effect of age group on payoff ratio: F(3,36) = 0.56, p = .46, ηp2 = 0.02 Age x Cognitive empathy interaction: F(3,36) = 5.9, p < .05, ηp2 = 0.14 High cognitive empathy, OA vs YA payoff ratio: M = 1.49, (SE = .13) vs M = 0.99, (SE = 0.13); t(21) = 2.64, p < .05, d = 1.15	ns +	F
	Repeated measures 2x2x2 ANOVA Post-hoc t-test	.	Main effect of age group on prosocial behaviour (rejection of unfair/fair offers): F(1,34) = 1.90, p = .18, ηp2 = 0.05 Age x Cognitive empathy x offer type interaction: F (1,34) = 4.31, p < .05, ηp2 = 0.11 High cognitive empathy, OA vs YA rejection of unfair offers: M = 79.0% (SE = 7.46) vs M = 42.7% (SE = 10.60), t(20) =	ns +	SO/F

			2.69, p < .05, d = 1.20 Low/High cognitive empathy, OA vs YA rejection of fair offers: t(15) = 1.23, p = .24, d = 0.63 t(20) = 0.27, p = .79, d = 0.12		
Besedes et al. 2012	Regressions with Probit and OLS Models	.	Optimal Choice: r = -0.04 (probit = 0.01), p < .01 Choice efficiency: r = -0.02 (OLS = 0.01), p < .01	- -	F
Best and Freund 2018	Bivariate correlations		Gain framed condition: r = 0.11, p = 0.22 Loss framed condition: ns (numerical data NR)	ns ns	O
Blanco et al. 2016 (1)	Independent samples t-test	.	t(108) = 2.40, p = .02, d = 0.46	-	O
Blanco et al. 2016 (2)	2x2 ANOVA Post-hoc Independent samples t-test	.	Main effect of age ns. Age x Condition Interaction: F(1,272) = 4.45, p = .04 Independent condition, YA vs OA: t(136) = 2.09, p = .04, d = 0.36 Dependent condition, YA vs OA: t(136) = 0.86, p = .39, d = 0.15	ns -	O

Boyle, Yu, Buchman, et al. 2012 (1)	Bivariate correlations	.	Decision making performance, r = -0.30 p < .001	-	H/F
	Linear regression model		Estimate = − 0.12, (SE = 0.01), p < .001	-	
Boyle, Yu, Wilson, et al. 2012 (2) (RUSH sample)	Bivariate correlations	Baseline age, gender, and years of education.	Decision making performance, r = -0.26, p < .001	-	H/F
	Linear regression model		Cognitive decline and DM in persons without dementia: EST = 20.06 (SE = 0.02)		
	Bivariate correlations	Baseline age, gender, and years of education.	Susceptibility to scams, r = 0.29, p < .001	-	H/F
	Linear regression model		Cognitive decline and DM in persons without dementia: EST = 20.02 (SE = 0.01)		
Brand and Schiebener 2013	Correlation	Gender and education considered independent factors.	GDT, r = -0.16, p < .001	-	F
	Analysis of variance of overall GDT performance with gender, education as independent factors, age as covariate.		GDT, Main effect of age: F(1,538) = 11.37, p < .001	-	
	Correlation	.	IGT, r = -0.17, p = .01	-	F

Bruine de Bruin, Strough and Parker 2015	Repeated measures multilevel model with age and size of irrecoverable loss as predictors	Controlled for presence of a friend	Willingness to cancel failing plans: *B* = 0.02, SE = 0.01, *p* = .01	+	SO/H
			Age x high/low irrecoverable loss interaction: *B* = 0.02, SE = 0.01, *p* = .02	+	
			High irrecoverable loss, older age: *B* = 0.02, SE = 0.01, *p* = .001	+	
			Low irrecoverable loss, older age: *B* = 0.01, SE = 0.01, *p* = .18	ns	
Caird et al. 2005	4x2 ANOVA	Multiple comparisons using a Bonferroni correction	Main effect of age on accuracy: F(3,58) = 18.78, p < .001	-	SA
Carvalho et al. 2012	Student t-test	.	p = .28	ns	F
Cassimiro et al. 2017	Spearman's correlation	.	Net score and age: rho = -0.01 p = .88	ns	F
Cavanagh et al. 2012	Hierarchical Bayesian model	.	Main effect of age: ns (No numerical results reported)	ns	O
			Age x condition interaction: ns (No numerical results reported)	ns	

Chung, Tymula and Glimcher 2017	Pearson correlation	.	r(36) = - 0.2, p = .22	ns	F
Cooper et al. 2017 (1)	2x2x2x8 ANOVA Post-hoc t-test	.	Main effect of age: F(1,39) = 12.59, p = .001, partial-η2 = 0.24 Age x condition interaction: F(1,39) = 7.29, p = .01, partial-η2 = 0.16 Gains condition, YA vs OA: t(41) = 1.05, p = .30 Loss condition, YA vs OA: t(41), YA vs OA, = 3.49, p = .001	- -	O
Cooper et al. 2017 (2)	2x2x2x8 ANOVA	.	Main effect of age: p = .76 Age x condition interaction: F(1,217) = 7.47, p < .001, partial-η2 = 0.03 Condition x age x order interaction: F(1,217) = 3.14, p = .01, partial-η2 = 0.01	ns -	O
Cooper et al. 2013	2×2 ANOVA Post-hoc a priori comparisons	.	Main effect of age: p > .10 Age X pressure interaction: F(1,85) = 11.21, p < .001, partial-η2 = 0.12 Pressure, YA vs OA: t(45) = 2.88, p < .006, d = 0.86	ns -	O

			No pressure, YA vs OA: t(40) = −1.83, p = .08, d = 0.58		
Cooper, Worthy and Maddox 2016	2×2ANOVA Post-hoc t-tests	.	Main effect of age: F(1,86) = 1.13, p = .29, partial η2 = 0.01	ns	O
			Age x forgone reward condition interaction: F(1,86) = 6.27, p = .01, partial η2 = 0.07	+	
			No information about foregone rewards, YA vs OA: p > .1		
			Information about true foregone rewards, YA vs OA: M = 8380 vs M = 7295, t(43) = 2.35, p = .02, d = 0.72		
			Information about false foregone rewards, YA vs OA: M = 10940 vs M = 10987, t(41) = 0 .15, p = .88, d - 0.05		
Deakin et al. 2004	Pearson's correlation ANCOVA	Bonferroni correction .	Age and decision quality: r = -0.17, p = .03 (uncorrected result; became non-significant after Bonferroni correction)	ns	O
			Effect of age on decision quality: F(3,172) = 4.33, p = .006	-	
Denburg et al.	Correlation	Demographic variables of age, gender,	r = -0.22, p < .01, d = 0.48	-	F

2009	Hierarchical regression	and education were entered first into hierarchical regression.	Age: β = 0.19, ns	ns	
Denburg et al. 2007 (1)	2x5 ANOVA	.	IGT, main effect of age: F(1,78) = 11.89, p < .01	-	F
			Age x trial block interaction: F(4,312) = 3.65, p <0.05	-	
Denburg et al. 2007 (2) (Includes Denburg et al. 2007 (1) sample)	2x3 ANOVA Post-hoc t-test	.	Purchase intentions for deceptive claims, main effect of age group: NR	NR	O
			Version x age group interaction: F(2,43) = 4.31, p < .02	-	
			OA impaired vs YA: t = 1.99, p < .06		
Denburg, Travel and Bechara 2005	2x5 ANOVA Follow-up analysis comparing OA impaired vs YA, 2x5 ANOVA	.	Main effect of age: F(1,78) = 11.89, p < .01 Main effect of group (OA impaired vs YA): ns	-	F
Di Rosa et al. 2017	Spearman's correlation	.	Age and total budget: r(34) = − 0.50; p < 0.005	-	F
	Mann-Whitney U Test		Total budget, YA vs OA: U = 95; p < .05	-	
Eberhardt, de	Pearson correlations	Adjusted for demographic	Age and resistance to sunk cost: r = 0.11; p	+	F

Bruin and Strough 2019	Linear and ordinal regressions	characteristics in linear regression.	< 0.001 Age and credit card repayment: r = 0.17 = ; p < 0.001 Resistance to sunk cost, unstandardised β coefficient = 0.01 (SE = 0.00), p <.001 Credit card repayment unstandardised β coefficient = 0.02 (SE = 0.00), p <.001	+ + +	
Eppinger, Heekeren and Li 2017	2x2 ANOVA Post-hoc test	.	Main effect of age on discounting delayed rewards: F(1,48) = 9.99, p = .003, ηg = 0.14 Age x decision conflict interaction: F(1,48) = 11.42 p = .001, ηg = 0.05 High conflict condition, YA vs OA: p < .001, ηg2 = 0.21 Low conflict condition, YA vs OA**:** p = .10	- - -	F
Fein, McGillivray and Finn 2007	Analysis of variance Polynomial regression	No adjustments, but association between gender, education and premorbid intelligence and performance examined. Gender: ns Premorbid intelligence: r = 0.11, p =	F(1,160) = 14.08, p < .001 Best fit was IGT performance as quadratic function of age: F(2,161) = 13.20, p < .001, IGT = 12.05 + 1.38 * age - 0.01 * age2, adjusted r2 = 0.13	- ns	F

		.15 Education: r = 0.18, p < .03			
Fernandes et al. 2019	Independent one-way ANOVAs	.	Main effect of age group in respondent role: F(186) = 1.82, p = .17, η2p = 0.04 Offer x group interaction: F(286) = 5.07, p = .01, η2p = 0.10 Unfair offers, OA vs YA: p = .03	ns -	F/SO
Girardi, Sala and MacPherson 2018	Logistic regression Post-hoc pairwise comparisons	.	Main effect of age on offer acceptance: χ2(5) = 76.65, p < .001 Group x offer type interaction: χ2(4) = 35.45, p < .001 Fair offers, YA vs OA: ns Unfair offers, YA vs OA: p < .01	- -	F/SO
Harle and Sanfey 2012	Linear mixed-model (with random intercept at the subject level and with age group)	Age as covariate made slopes more negative	Amount x age group interaction: F(3,260) = 4.9, p < .005 Age group difference in acceptance of $3 offers: beta = −27.3%, p < .005 Age group difference in acceptance of $1, $2, $5 offers: ns	- -	F/SO

Henninger, Madden and Huettel 2010	Hierarchical approach with age as categorical variable	.	Decision quality, YA vs OA: p > .01 Decision quality on low probability of winning options, YA vs OA: p < .001 Decision quality on BART, YA vs OA: p < .001	ns - -	F F O
Hess et al. 2018 (1)	2x2x4 ANOVA	.	Age effects on winnings: p > .08	ns	F
	2x2x4 ANOVA Moderator analysis	Controlled for memory measured as whether participant recalled critical strategy	Main effect of age on optimal choice: ns Moderator effect of age on optimal choice: F(1,181) = 4.98, p = .005, η2 partial = 0.07. Description only condition, YA vs OA: p = .08 (ns after controlling for memory) Description and experience condition, YA vs OA: ns Experience only condition, YA vs OA: ns	ns ns	F
Hess et al. 2018 (2)	2x3x2x3 ANOVA	.	Main effect of age on proportion of times certain option was chosen ns Age x probability interaction: F(1,117) = 3.51 p = .06, η2 partial = 0.03 YA, Low probability vs High probability	ns	F

			condition: F(1,120) = 125.36, p < .001, η2 partial = 0.68 OA, Low probability vs High probability condition: F(1,114) = 29.32, p< .001, η2 partial = 0.34.		
Hess, Queen and Patterson 2012	Logistic regression	.	Main effect of age: ns (No numerical results reported)	ns	O
Huang et al. 2015	2x2 mixed-model ANOVA	Education as covariate	CCT, Main effect of age: NR CCT, Age x task interaction: F(1,127) = 7.90, p = .01, η2p = 0.06	NR -	F/O
	2x4 mixed-model ANOVA	Education as covariate	IGT, Main effect of age: NR IGT, Age x deck A and B selection: NS IGT, Age x deck C and D selection: F(1,127) = 6.59, p = .011, η2p 0.05 Decks A/B (Disadvantageous decks), YA vs OA: both ns (No numerical results reported) Deck C/D (Advantageous decks) , YA vs OA: M = 17.80 (SD = 10.28) vs M = 21.49 (SD = 9.72), t(128) = 2.10, p = .04, d = 0.37/M = 31.20 (SD = 14.74) vs M = 26.86	NR ns -	F

			(SD = 11.64), t(128) = 1.86, p = .07, d = 0.33		
James et al. 2012 (RUSH sample)	Linear Regression Interaction models testing for effect variation	Adjusted for age, sex, education and global cognition, income, depression, and chronic medical conditions	Total literacy, r = -0.34, p <.001 Total literacy x age interaction: estimate = 0.02, SE = 0.01, p = .02 Health literacy, r = -0.32, p <.001 Health literacy x age interaction: estimate = 0.01, SE = 0.01, p = .05 Financial literacy, r = -0.25, p <.001 Financial literacy x age interaction: estimate = 0.02, SE = 0.01, p = .02	- ns - - -	F/H
Jimura et al. 2011	2x2 ANOVA Post-hoc t-test	.	Main effect of age: NR Age x reward domain interaction: F(1,38) = 5.09, p < .05 Discounting of monetary rewards, YA vs OA: t(38) = 2.14, p < .05 Discounting of liquid rewards, YA vs OA: t(38) = −.80, p = .42	NR +	F/O
Koscienlniak 2016	2 x 2 ANVOVA	.	Main effect of age on adjusted number of pumps: F(1,157) = 23.07, p < .001 Main effect of age total points: F(1,157) =	- -	O

			10.16, p = .002		
			Main effect of age on number of explosions experienced: F(1,157) = 12.88, p < .001	-	
Li et al. 2017	Three-factor ANOVA	Ran one-way ANOVAs with gender	Main effect of age on average adjusted pumps: F(1,185) = 27.53, p < .001	-	O
Li et al. 2013	Structural equation model	.	β = 0.12, p < .10	ns	F
Li et al. 2015	Structural equation model	Controlling for crystallised and fluid intelligence	Main effect of age: 0.99 (SE = 0.34), p < .01	+	F
	Structural equation model	.	Main effect of age on optimal credit card repayment plan: 0.03 (SE = 0.04), p > .05	ns	F
			Main effect of age on optimal choice of health plan: 0.02 (SE = 0.01), p > .05	ns	
Lobjois and Cavallo 2007	3x2x2 ANOVA	.	Main effect of age on unsafe decisions: NR	NR	SA
Lockenhoff et al. 2016 (1)	Chi-square test	Age differences in pain sensitivity, and gender, ethnicity held constant in sampling	Dread sensitivity, χ2 (1, N = 60) = 0.07, p = .80	ns	SA
	Non-parametric correlation		Dread sensitivity, ρ = 0.05, p = .71, 95%CI [−0.21, 0.3]	ns	
Lockenhoff et al. 2016 (2)	Non-parametric correlation	Screened for potentially confounding variables and other variables recorded	Dread sensitivity, ρ = −0.07, p = .47, 95%CI [−0.25, 0.11]	ns	SA

		and taken as covariates in follow up analysis.			
Ma and Chen 2015	Logistic regression (with maximum utility choice as DV and age and emotion condition as IV)	.	Main effect of age on accuracy: ns (No numerical results reported)	ns	**F**/O
MacPherson, Phillips and Sala 2002	Two-way ANOVA	Adjusted for education	Main effect of age: F(2,87) = 0.73, MSE = 147.80, η2p = 0.02 Block x age interaction: F(8,348) = 0.93, MSE = 55.80, η2p = 0.02	ns ns	F
Mata, Schooler and Rieskamp 2007	Repeated measures 2x2 ANOVA	Education as a covariate	F(1,159) = 21.92, p < .001, η2p = 0.12	-	**F**/O
Mata, von Helversen and Rieskamp 2010	Repeated measures 2x2 ANOVA	.	Effect of age: F(1,96) = 34.94, p < .001, η2p = 0.27 Block x age x environment: F(6,91) = 2.76, p = .02, η2p = 0.15	- -	F
Mikels et al. 2013	Chi-square test 2x2x2 ANOVA	Cognitive ability (as measured with verbal fluency and digit symbol substitution score)	χ2(1, N = 60) = 9.93, p < .005 Main effect of age on nonoptimal choice selection: F(1,58) = 8.54, p < .01, η2p =	- -	O

			0.12		
Mikels et al. 2010	2x3x3 ANOVA Post-hoc t-test	.	Main effect of age on non-optimal responding: F(1,114) = 8.16, p < .01, η2p = 0.05	-	H
			Age x condition interaction: F(2,114) = 6.83, p < .005, η2p = 0.11 Information-focused condition, YA vs OA: t(38) = 2.21, p < .05 Emotion-focused condition, YA vs OA: t(38) = 0.84, p >.35	-	
Pachur, Mata and Hertwig 2017	Mixed effects logistic regression	Gender, educational attainment, assets as covariates	Gain domain: b = -0.24, 95%CI [−0.45, −0.04], OR = 0.78, 95%CI [0.64, 0.96] Loss domain: b = −0.43 95%CI [−0.67, −0.19], OR = 0.65, 95%CI [0.51, 0.83] Mixed domain: b = −0.21, 95%CI [−0.44, 0.02], OR = 0.81, 95%CI [0.64, 1.02]	ns	F
Pachur et al. 2009 (1)	2x2x2 ANOVA	Education, age, environment, task order as covariates	Accuracy in inference task, main effect of age in both environments: F(1,76) = 1.45, p = .23	ns	O
Pachur et al. 2009 (2)	2x2 ANOVA	.	Accuracy in inference task, main effect of age: F(1,110) = 4.7, p = .03	+	O

Pertl et al. 2017	Man-Whitney U tests Post-hoc analyses	.	U = 72.50, p = .002, d = 1.13 Easy Items, YA vs OA: U= 77.00, p = .002, d = 1.06 Difficult items, YA vs OA: p > .05	-	H
Queen and Hess 2010	Binomial test comparing YA performance vs chance; OA performance vs chance	.	Deliberative, Unconscious thought condition YA vs chance: 0.41, ns OA vs chance: 0.28, ns Deliberative, Conscious thought condition YA vs chance: 0.50, p < .05 OA vs chance: 0.38, ns Intuitive, Unconscious thought condition YA vs chance: 0.72, p< .05 OA vs chance: 0.47, p< .05 Intuitive, Conscious thought condition YA vs chance: 0.62, p< .05 OA vs chance: 0.46, p< .05	NA	O
Rieger and Mata 2013	Mixed effects regression	Controlled for potential variables of interest, such as gender, literacy, and household size to account for cohort effects	Risk taking, B = −0.01, SE = 0.005, p < .05, R2 = 0.15	-	F

	Mixed effects regression	Controlled for potential variables of interest, such as gender, literacy, and household size to account for cohort effects	Generosity in dictator game, B = 0.01, SE = 0.01 p > .05, R2 = 0.10	ns	SO/F
	Mixed effects regression	Controlled for potential variables of interest, such as gender, literacy, and household size to account for cohort effects	Public goods game, B = 0.02, SE = 0.01, p < .05, R2 = 0.15	+	SO/F
Roalf et al. 2012	Repeated measures 2x5 mixed ANOVA	Income as covariate	UG, main effect of age on offer acceptance: F(1,57) = 6.15, p = .01	-	F
	Regression		UG, age x offer acceptance interaction: F(4,228) = 1.64, p = .19	ns	
			Economic decision-making (UG and Dictator game), age as individual predictor in hierarchical regression model: F(1,58) = 5.59, p = .02, R2 = 0.9	-	
	Repeated measures mixed-model ANOVA	.	Dictator game, main effect of age on delay discounting: F(1,53) = 1.47, p = .23	ns	F
	Regression		Dictator game, age as individual predictor in hierarchical regression model: F(1,54) = 2.91, p = .09, R2 = 0.5	ns	

	T-test	.	Dictator game, amount offered to others, YA vs OA: t(53) = 0.40, p = .70	ns	SO/F
	Chi-square test				
	Regression		Dictator game, YA/OA funds distribution equally vs unequally: Pearson X2(1) = ns/Pearson X2(1) = 3.87, p = .05	NA	
			Dictator game, age as individual predictor in hierarchical regression model: F(1,54) = 0.41, p = .53, R2 = 0.1	ns	
Rogalsky et al. 2012	Correlation	.	r = -0.18 p = .27	ns	F
Rolison, Hanoch and Wood 2012	Correlation	.	Age and Average Adjusted Pumps: r = -0.12, p = 0.28	ns	O
	2x3 ANOVA		Main effect of age: ns (No numerical results reported)	ns	
Rolison, Wood and Hanoch 2017 (1)	Random effects logistic regression	Including age and scenario as factors, and controlled for prior decisions	Posterior decision-making, OR = 0.09, t = 5.39, p < .001	+	F/H/O
Rolison, Wood and Hanoch 2017 (2)	Random effects logistic regression	Controlled for prior decisions	Posterior decision-making, OR = 0.38 (0.16, 0.92), p < .05	+	F/H/O
Rosen, Brand and	Pearson's	.	Age and moral decisions: r = 0.24, p <	+	SO

Kalbe 2016	correlations		0.001		
			Age and Low emotional moral decisions: r = 0.29 p < .001	+	
			Age and High emotional moral decisions: r = 0.08, p = .25	ns	
Rutledge et al. 2016	Pearson's correlation	Test model in sample controlled for education, region, android vs apple smartphone use	Mixed trails, Earnings: r = -0.004, p > .10	ns	F
			Gains trials, Earnings: r = -0.05, p < .001		
			Loss trials, Earnings: r = -0.01, p > .10	- ns	
Rydzewska et al. 2018 (1)	Linear mixed-model	.	Sequential decision-making, main effect of age: b = 1.67, SE = 0.41, t(102) = 4.11, p < .001	-	F/O
Rydzewska et al. 2018 (2)	Linear mixed-models	.	Sequential decision-making, main effect of age: b = 1.46, SE = 0.62, t(122) = 2.35, p = .02	-	F/O
			Age x Task phase interaction: b = 1.52, SE = 0.75, t (122) = 2.03, p = .05	-	
			Age x Order x Task phase interaction: b = -2.93, SE = 1.06, t (122) = -2.76, p = .01	-	
Schiebener and Brand 2017	ANOVA	Controlled for gender on analyses of last 60 trials	Effect of age group on overall IGT net score: p = .005	-	F

(Includes Brand and Schiebener 2013 sample)		Reasoning and	Effect of age group on IGT net score, first 40 trials: F(4,205) = 1.37 p = .25, partial η2 = .03	ns	
			Effect of age group on IGT net score, , last 60 trials: F(4,205) = 4.41 p = .002, partial η2 = .08	-	
	ANOVA	.	GDT, Net score, F (4,205) = 2.67, p = .03, partial η2 = .05	-	F
Seaman et al. 2018	Partial correlation	Bias corrected and accelerated bootstrapped	Decision preference (proportion of sooner options chosen): 0.06 [-0.18, 0.28]	ns	F/O
			Discount rate: -0.02 [-0.25, 0.21]	ns	
	Partial correlation	Bias corrected and accelerated bootstrapped	Decision preference (proportion of higher probability chosen): 0.11 [-0.13, 0.33]	ns	F
			Discount rate: 0.23 [0, 0.44]	- ns	
	Partial correlation	Bias corrected and accelerated bootstrapped	Decision preference (proportion of sooner options chosen): 0.22 [-0.01, 0.42]	ns	F
			Discount rate: 0.1 [-0.13, 0.32]		
Seaman et al. 2016	3x3 ANCOVA	Age as covariate	Discounting, main effect of age: F(1,90) = 3.94, p = .050, ng2 = 0 .01	-	F/SO/H

		Discounting factor (temporal/probability/effort) x age interaction: F(2,180) = 6.29, p < .002, ng2 = 0.03	-	
Multiple linear regression	Tested quadratic effect of age to test for non-linearity	Temporal discounting, Money: Age = 0.14 [- 0.07, 0.35], R2 = 0.019, p > .05	ns	F/SO/H
		Temporal discounting, social: Age = 0.26 [0.06, 0.47], R2 = 0.07, p < .05	-	
		Temporal discounting, health: Age = 0.36 [0.17, 0.56], R2 = 0.13 p < .001	-	
Multiple linear regression	Tested quadratic effect of age to test for non-linearity	Probability discounting, money: Age = 0.04 [- 0.17, .25], R2 = 0.00, p > .05	ns	F/SO/H
		Probability discounting, social: Age2 = - 0.28 [- 0.48, - 0.08], R2 Change = 0.08, p < .01	+	
		Probability discounting, health: Age = 0.22 [0.02, 0.43], R2 = 0.05, p < .05	-	
Multiple linear regression	Tested quadratic effect of age to test for non-linearity	Effort discounting, money: Age = -0.24 [- 0.43, - 0.04], p < .05; Age2 = - 0.29 [0.09, 0.49] , R2 Change = 0.08, p < .01	+	F/SO/H
		Effort discounting, social: Age2 = 0.25	-	

			[0.05, 0.45] , R2 Change = 0.06, p < .05 Effort discounting, health: Age = - 0.13 [-0.33, 0.08], R2 = 0.02, p > .05	ns	
Sparrow and Spaniol 2018 (1)	Omnibus 2x3 ANOVA Post-hoc t-tests	.	Main effect of age in reward index: NR Age x reward type interaction: F(1,52) = 91.29 = 15.92, p < .01 Gain condition, YA vs OA: t(60) = 4.53, p < .01, d = 1.13 Loss condition, YA vs OA: t(60) = 1.76, p = .09, d = 0.44 Donation condition, YA vs OA: t(60) = 2.27, p = .03, d = 0.57	NR +	F/SO
Sparrow and Spaniol 2018 (2)	Omnibus ANOVA	.	Main effect of age in reward index: ns (No numerical results reported)	ns	F/SO
Stewart et al. 2018 (RUSH Sample)	Bivariate correlation Multiple regression, path analysis	Modified conceptual model by removing paths linking age and education to risk aversion	r = -0.32, p <.001 Total standard effect of age on DM: Est = -0.28, SE = 0.03, p < .001 Direct age effect: Est = - 0.11, SE = 0.02, p < .001	-	F/H
Strough et al. 2016	Stepped linear regression	,	Willingness to cancel failing plans: *B* = 0.01, *SE* = 0. 01, *t* = 2.19, *p* = .03	+	SO/H

Tymula et al. 2013	T-test	Robust to demographic, financial, and psychological variables	Loss in expected earnings, YA vs OA: 19.3% vs 46.1%, $p < .001$ Loss in expected earnings, MA vs OA: 9.6% vs 46.1%, $p < .001$	- -	F
Von Helversen and Mata 2012	T-test	.	Performance, YA vs OA: $t(43.19) = 3.8$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.97$	-	F
Walker, Fisk and Mcguire 1997	2x5x4 ANOVA	.	Main effect of age on optimal route selection: ns (No numerical results reported)	ns	O
Wayde et al. 2017	Chi-square test Wilcoxon signed ranks test	.	Inferencing condition, YA vs OA: familiar condition - $\chi2(1) = 9.98$, $p = .002$; non-familiar condition - $\chi2(1) = 0.60$, $p > .05$ Non-inferencing condition, YA vs OA: familiar condition - $\chi2 (1) = 0.40$, $p = .52$; non-familiar condition - $\chi2 (1) = 3.04$, $p = .08$	- ns	O
Wood et al. 2005	2X4 Mixed ANOVA	.	Main effect of age on gambling score: $F(1,153) = 0.38$, $p = .54$	ns	F
Wood et al. 2011	Multivariate logistic regression	Added control measures to model, female, other race/ethnicity, college graduate, married	Adjusted OR = 0.96 [0.94, 0.98], $p < .01$	-	F

Worthy et al. 2014	2x2x2x5 Repeated measures ANOVA	.	Overall (both task), main effect of age: $F(1,174) = 13.42$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta 2 = 0.07$,	+	O
	ANOVA for increasing/decreasing optimal task separately		Increasing-optimal task, main effect of age: $F(1,82) = 2.74$, $p = .10$	ns	
			Decreasing-optimal task, main effect of age: $F(1,92) = 14.97$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta 2 = 0.14$	+	
Worthy et al. 2016	Mixed ANOVA	.	Main effect of age: both $F < 1$; ns (No numerical results reported)	ns	O
Worthy et al. 2011 (1)	Independent samples t-test	.	$t(54) = -2.17$, $p < .05$	ns	O
Worthy et al. 2011 (2)	2x2x5 repeated measures ANOVA	.	Main effect of age: NR	NR	O
	2x2 ANOVA (excluding block)		Main effect of age: $F(1,100) = 4.80$, $p < .05$, $\eta 2 = 0.05$	+	
Zamarian et al. 2008	5x2 Repeated measures ANOVA	.	Main effect of age on performance: $F(1,83) = 0.45$, $MSE = .14$, $p = .50$	-	F
	Chi-square test	.	Proportion classified as good decision makers YA vs OA: 69.7% vs 67.3%; $\chi 2$-tests, $p > .1$	ns	F

[a]Abbreviations as follows: Rush memory and ageing project, RUSH; Decision-making, DM; YA, younger adults; OA, older adults; MA, middle aged adults; ANOVA, analysis of variance; ANCOVA, analysis of covariance; CI, confidence interval; [,], CI lower limit, CI upper limit; DV, dependent variable; IV, independent variable; MSE, mean standard error; OR, odds ratio; vs, versus; SD, standard deviation; SE, standard error; n, sample size; MANOVA, multivariate analysis of variance; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported, M, mean; Ms, mean squares; ns, non-significant; ns, non-significant; -/+, significant negative/positive association between decision-making and older age; F, financial; SO, social; H, health; SA, safety; O, other.

Meta-analysis of studies comparing decision-making in older and younger adult

When meta-analysis was carried out the combined estimate was statistically significant in indicating poorer decision-making in older as compared to younger adults (k = 57, d_{random} = -0.17, 95% CI -0.29, -0.04, I^2 = 92.92%) (shown in Fig. I) however, heterogeneity was high and individual studies varied considerably (for funnel plots refer to Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. III). This finding was magnified when studies of intertemporal judgement tasks were excluded (k = 46, d_{random} = -0.24, 95% CI -0.39, -0.09, I^2 = 93.38%) (Online Resource: Supplementary Table II).

Older compared to younger adults, decision-making domain

Meta-analysis by decision-making domain (financial, social or health related decisions) found combined estimates showing poorer financial (k = 36, d_{random} = -0.25, 95% CI -0.45, -0.04, I^2 = 94.68%) and social decision-making (k = 14, d_{random} = -0.38, 95% CI -0.72, -0.03, I^2 = 92.9%) in older adults as compared to younger adults, as shown in Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. II). However, these were not significant for health decision-making (k = 5, d_{random} = 0.34, 95% CI -0.31, 0.99, I^2 = 95.02%; Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. II). Task demands, specifically risk and independent variable type moderated the effect of age on social decision-making. Post-hoc sensitivity analyses excluding one study of risky choice resulted in non-significant negative summary effect, (d_{random} = -0.26, 95% CI -0.54, 0.25, I^2 = 92.84%). However, the exclusion of studies which employed age as continuous variable did not materially affect the results, (d_{random} = -0.59, 95% CI -1.01, -0.18, I^2 = 88.5%). There were insufficient studies (k = 2) to allow for meaningful meta-analysis of safety-related decision-making. Moderators including mean sample age, task type, additional task demands, and adjustment for socio-economic factors did not materially alter the results for the financial and health decision-making domains (see Online Resource: Supplementary Table IV).

Figure I

Forest plot showing individual and summary effects for 55 studies on age and overall decision-making



Note. Cohen's d effects summary effects and 95% CI represented, with positive effects representing better decision making in older adults as compared to younger adults. A restricted maximum likelihood model was employed.

Assessment of bias

Included studies were broadly similar in their overall reviewer-rated risk of bias (Online Resource: Supplementary Table IV). High risk of bias generally resulted from inadequate sample size, no a priori sample size calculation, a lack of statistical adjustment for potential confounders, and the use of a cross-sectional design. On the other hand, many studies reported using validated decision-making tasks (e.g., IGT, UG, GDT, BART), recruiting roughly even numbers of older and younger adults and exposing them to the same experimental conditions.

Discussion

This review systematically synthesizes the available evidence comparing decision-making in earlier and later life across three real-world decision-making domains. More than half of the studies included in the systematic review provided support for an age-related change in decision-making with older adults performing more poorly when judged against achieving prespecified goals in standard decision tasks. Differences in studies could be explained to some extent by the nature of the decision tasks. In particular, positive associations between age and decision-making were observed across decision-tasks that involved altruism or prosocial considerations (Bailey et al. 2013; Beadle et al. 2012; Rosen et al. 2016; Sparrow and Spaniol 2018), response to risk (Rolison et al. 2017), inferencing (Pachur et al. 2009), resistance to sunk cost (Strough et al. 2015) and real-world credit scores (Li et al. 2015). Age differences in overall and financial decision-making were robust, with older adults performing more poorly than their younger counterparts although individual studies estimates varied widely.

Previous reviews (Best and Charness 2015; Thornton and Dumke 2005) have identified interpersonal considerations as an important moderator of age-differences in decision-making. Thornton and Dumke observed that age-associated declines in everyday

problem-solving and decision-making effectiveness were attenuated when decisions had interpersonal significance. In their review, older adults appear to perform more favourably when outcomes resulted in mutual benefit. Broader research has also shown that older age is linked to increased altruism , better interpersonal problem solving, and prioritisation of social considerations in decision-making (Best and Charness 2015; Blanchard-Fields et al. 2007), Best and Charness similarly highlighted the important interplay between decisions involving interpersonal factors and age. Older adults were less risk-seeking than younger adults in positively framed morality-based scenario conditions.

Whilst the focus of our review was to summarise the existing evidence rather than to delve into the potential drivers behind the differences, we highlight two potential explanatory theories that may provide insight to help to explain age differences in decision outcomes. The Selection, Optimisation and Compensation model (SOC) and Socioemotional Selectivity Theory (SST). SOC hypothesises that individuals use selection (elective and loss-based selection), optimisation and compensation based strategies to function effectively in different situations (Baltes and Carstensen 1996). Increasing age may be associated with better use of strategies for dealing with changing situations. However, in older age, structural changes in the prefrontal cortex and associated declines in cognitive abilities and processing speed may mean greater dependence on strategies like selection and optimisation, and less use of effortful, deliberative decision-making processes (Kahneman 2003). Reduced reliance upon deliberative processing may have stronger effects in financial decision-making tasks, particularly those completed under explicit risk conditions (Bangma et al. 2017; Ellen Peters et al. 2007). SST by contrast posits that shrinking time horizons in later life lead older adults to increasingly prioritise emotionally meaningful goals with short term rewards (e.g., charity) over goals facilitating self-sustenance and long-term payoff (e.g., building wealth) (Lockenhoff et al. 2016). The prioritisation of socio-emotional goals may result in lower

motivation to perform on tasks with individual financial reward and increased drive to act in favour of a decision partner, even if this strategy results in negative individual consequences. The role of age-related neurobiological changes on individual and prosocial decision-making is less clear (Han et al. 2015; James et al. 2015).

In summary, older adults perform marginally worse that younger adults overall in decision-making tasks with a level of applicability to real-world outcomes. This appears to be driven by an overrepresentation of financial compared to social and health decision-making studies and greater consistency across summary effects within the financial domain. The small number of studies that have explored age-differences in social, health and safety decision-making have produced inconsistent results.

Strengths and Limitations

There are several methodological strengths and limitations of the present research. The final search terms were selected based on sensitivity and specificity and applied to three leading scientific databases; however, we did not include the 'grey' literature and it is therefore possible some studies were not captured. To minimise this risk, the reference list of existing systematic reviews was also searched. The inclusive eligibility criteria led to heterogeneity in the study populations but allowed us to capture the widest possible scope of evidence resulting in a substantial body of data with representation across financial, social, health and non-risky decisions which was further explored using a series of potential moderators (Doi et al. 2011). However, we were inevitably limited by the published evidence, the types of decision-making paradigms that were available in the literature and the quality of constituent studies. One possible alternative for future consideration would be to conduct an individual participant data-analysis, which, while time-intensive, allows for verification of published results, the inclusion of unreported findings, and standardisation of statistical analysis albeit at the cost of standardising disparate outcomes. Evidence on

decision-making response tendencies or preferences that could not be categorised as better or worse were deemed as less relevant to the interpretation of the results, and thus excluded.

Overall, the evidence base in this area is also lacking published prospective data. While experimental research facilitates greater methodological rigour, replicability, and a closer approximation of causal relationships , prospective studies have been argued to be better suited for investigating gradual and long-term processing changes across the life course. Furthermore, the scope of this high-level synthesis on age differences in financial, social, health and safety decision-making prohibited investigation into the mechanisms underlying observed age effects. Nevertheless, this review summarises valuable high-level evidence regarding age differences in decision-making, illuminates methodological issues and knowledge gaps and points to future directions for the field.

Future Directions

As highlighted by the overrepresentation of financial decision-making evidence, more studies of social, health and safety-related decision-making with greater ecological validity would be a welcome addition to the literature. Secondly, the consistent application of validated decision-making measures across future studies will be critical to overcoming issues of generalisability, and replicability. Relative to clinical or neuroimageing tools, decision-making tasks often require minimal supervision and clinical interpretation, which may enhance their utility and accessibility across different contexts. Thirdly, synthesising the evidence from studies of decisions outcomes that are not categorisable as better or worse (e.g., preferences for advertisements with more or less information) and the mechanisms underpinning observed age differences in decision-making would build upon the work of the present review. There is also a clear need for further in-depth reviews of the potential mechanisms, which, whilst beyond the scope of this work would help to further disentangle the results from the experimental studies and help in the design of future data collection.

Fourthly, the generation of prospective data will be necessary to understand how decision processes change with age on an intra-individual level. The inclusion of decision-making measures within ongoing longitudinal studies, albeit with the need to take account of learning effects, may be one efficient way to achieve this research goal. Lastly, consensus on terminology and operationalising decision-making across gerontological and psychological research will strengthen the interpretability and comparability of future findings.

Statements and declarations

Impact Statement

Age differences in decision-making have important implications for the ways that decision-making is supported, and the information that is provided to adults at different ages. This is particularly relevant for decisions that may have significant health, financial or social consequences. Currently our policies and practices do not take explicit account of the potential changes in decision-making ability with ageing. Our review speaks to the importance of taking this into account and highlights the need for further research.

Ethical statement

An ethics statement was not required for this study type, no human or animal subjects or materials were used.

Competing interest and Funding

We have no conflicts of interest to disclose. Nicole Ee co-conceived the research, carried out the review processes and wrote the first draft. Brooke Brady carried out the review processes, refined the protocol and contributed to the writing of the article. Craig Sinclair carried out the review processes, refined the protocol and contributed to the writing of the article. Kaarin Jane Anstey co-conceived the research and commented on the article. Ruth Peters co-conceived the research, carried out the review processes and contributed to the

writing of the article. This work was supported by a grant from the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence in Population Ageing Research.

Data availability statement

All data used or generated in this study are from previously published work. Further enquiries can be directed to the corresponding author**.**

References

Bailey PE, Ruffman T, Rendell PG (2013) Age-related differences in social economic decision making: the ultimatum game. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci 68(3):356-363. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbs073

Bakos DS, Couto MC, Melo WV, Parente MA, Koller SH, Bizarro L (2008) Executive functions in the young elderly and oldest old: a preliminary comparison emphasizing decision making. Psychol Neurosci 1(2):183-189.

Baltes MM, Carstensen LL (1996) The Process of Successful Ageing. Ageing Soc 16(4):397-422. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X00003603

Bangma DF, Fuermaier AB, Tucha L, Tucha O, Koerts J (2017) The effects of normal ageing on multiple aspects of financial decision-making. PLoS One 12(8):e0182620.

Bauer AS, Timpe JC, Edmonds EC, Bechara A, Tranel D, Denburg NL (2013) Myopia for the future or hypersensitivity to reward? Age-related changes in decision making on the Iowa Gambling Task. Emotion 13(1):19-24. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029970

Beadle JN, Paradiso S, Kovach C, Polgreen L, Denburg NL, Tranel D (2012) Effects of age-related differences in empathy on social economic decision-making. Int Psychogeriatr 24(5):822-833. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1041610211002547

Besedeš T, Deck C, Sarangi S, Shor M (2012) Decision-making Strategies and Performance among Seniors. J Econ Behav Organ 81(2):524-533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2011.07.016

Besedeš T, Deck C, Sarangi S, Shor M (2012) Age effects and heuristics in decision making. Rev Econ Stat 94(2):580-595.

Best R, Charness N (2015) Age differences in the effect of framing on risky choice: a meta-analysis. Psychol Ageing 30(3):688-698. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039447

Best R, Freund AM (2018) Age, loss minimization, and the role of probability for decision-making. Gerontology 64(5):475-484.

Blanchard-Fields F, Mienaltowski A, Seay RB (2007) Age differences in everyday problem-solving effectiveness: older adults select more effective strategies for interpersonal problems. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci 62(1):P61-P64.

Blanco NJ, Love BC, Ramscar M, Otto AR, Smayda K, Maddox WT (2016) Exploratory decision-making as a function of lifelong experience, not cognitive decline. J Exp Psychol Gen 145(3):284-297. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000133

Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR (2010) A basic introduction to fixed effect and random effects models for meta analysis. Res Synth Methods 1(2):97-111.

Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR (2011) Introduction to meta-analysis. John Wiley & Sons.

Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR (2017) Basics of meta-analysis: I(2) is not an absolute measure of heterogeneity. Res Synth Methods 8(1):5-18. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1230

Boyle PA, Yu L, Buchman AS, Bennett DA (2012) Risk Aversion is Associated with Decision Making among Community-Based Older Persons. Front Psychol 3:205. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00205

Boyle PA, Yu L, Wilson RS, Gamble K, Buchman AS, Bennett DA (2012) Poor decision making is a consequence of cognitive decline among older persons without Alzheimer's disease or mild cognitive impairment. PLoS One 7(8):e43647. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043647

Brand M, Schiebener J (2013) Interactions of age and cognitive functions in predicting decision making under risky conditions over the life span. J Clin Exp Neuropsychol 35(1):9-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803395.2012.740000

Bruine de Bruin W, Parker AM, Fischhoff B (2007) Individual differences in adult decision-making competence. J Pers Soc Psychol 92(5):938.

Bruine de Bruin W, Parker AM, Fischhoff B (2012) Explaining adult age differences in decision making competence. J Behav Decis Mak 25(4):352-360.

Bruine de Bruin W, Strough J, Parker AM (2014) Getting older isn't all that bad: better decisions and coping when facing "sunk costs". Psychol Aging 29(3):642.

Caird JK, Edwards CJ, Creaser JI, Horrey WJ (2005) Older driver failures of attention at intersections: using change blindness methods to assess turn decision accuracy. Hum Factors 47(2):235-249. https://doi.org/10.1518/0018720054679542

Carvalho JC, de Oliveira Cardoso C, Shneider-Bakos D, Kristensen CH, Fonseca RP (2012) The effect of age on decision making according to the Iowa gambling task. Span J Psychol 15(2):480-486. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22774421

Cassimiro L, Fuentes D, Nitrini R, Yassuda MS (2017) Decision-making in Cognitively Unimpaired Illiterate and Low-educated Older Women: results on the iowa gambling task. Arch Clin Neuropsychol 32(1):71-80. https://doi.org/10.1093/arclin/acw080

Cavanagh JF, Neville D, Cohen MX, Van de Vijver I, Harsay H, Watson P, Buitenweg JI, Ridderinkhof KR (2012) Individual differences in risky decision-making among seniors reflect increased reward sensitivity. Front Neurosci 6:11.

Chung HK, Tymula A, Glimcher P (2017) The Reduction of Ventrolateral Prefrontal Cortex Gray Matter Volume Correlates with Loss of Economic Rationality in Ageing. J Neurosci 37(49):12068-12077. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1171-17.2017

Cooper JA, Worthy DA, Gorlick MA, Maddox WT (2013) Scaffolding across the lifespan in history-dependent decision-making. Psychol Aging 28(2):505-514.

Cooper JA, Worthy DA, Maddox WT (2016) Information about foregone rewards impedes dynamic decision-making in older adults. Neuropsychol Dev Cogn B Ageing Neuropsychol Cogn 23(1):103-116. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2015.1052364

Deakin J, Aitken M, Robbins T, Sahakian BJ (2004) Risk taking during decision-making in normal volunteers changes with age. J Int Neuropsychol Soc 10(4):590-598.

Del Missier F, Hansson P, Parker AM, Bruine de Bruin W, Mäntylä T. (2020) Decision-making competence in older adults: a rosy view from a longitudinal investigation. Psychol Aging 35(4):553.

Denburg NL, Weller JA, Yamada TH, Shivapour DM, Kaup AR, LaLoggia A, Cole CA, Tranel D, Bechara A (2009) Poor decision making among older adults is related to elevated levels of neuroticism. Ann Behav Med 37(2):164-172.

Denburg NL, Cole CA, Hernandez M, Yamada TH, Tranel D, Bechara A, Wallace RB (2007) The orbitofrontal cortex, real-world decision making, and normal ageing. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1121(1):480-498. https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1401.031

Denburg NL, Tranel D, Bechara A (2005) The ability to decide advantageously declines prematurely in some normal older persons. Neuropsychologia 43(7):1099-1106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.09.012

Di Rosa E, Mapelli D, Arcara G, Amodio P, Tamburin S, Schiff S (2017) Ageing and risky decision-making: new ERP evidence from the iowa gambling task. Neurosci Lett 640:93-98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2017.01.021

Doi SA, Barendregt JJ, Mozurkewich EL (2011) Meta-analysis of heterogeneous clinical trials: an empirical example. Contemp Clin Trials 32(2):288-298.

Eberhardt W, Bruine de Bruin W, Strough J (201) Age differences in financial decision making: the benefits of more experience and less negative emotions. J Behav Decis Mak 32(1):79-93.

Eppinger B, Heekeren HR, Li SC (2017) Age Differences in the Neural Mechanisms of Intertemporal Choice Under Subjective Decision Conflict. Cereb Cortex 28(11):3764-3774. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhx239

Fein G, McGillivray S, Finn P (2007) Older adults make less advantageous decisions than younger adults: cognitive and psychological correlates. J Int Neuropsychol Soc 13(3):480-489. https://doi.org/10.1017/S135561770707052X

Fernandes C, Gonçalves AR, Pasion R, Ferreira-Santos F, Barbosa F, Martins IP, Marques-Teixeira J (2019) Age-related changes in social decision-making: an electrophysiological analysis of unfairness evaluation in the Ultimatum Game. Neurosci Lett 692:122-126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2018.10.061

Finucane ML, Mertz CK, Slovic P, Schmidt ES (2005) Task complexity and older adults' decision-making competence. Psychol Aging 20(1):71.

Fontaine M, Le Floch V, Lemercier C (2021) Gambling and ageing: less illusion but more risk. Aging Soc 43(3):556-75.

Girardi A, Sala SD, MacPherson SE (2018) Theory of mind and the Ultimatum Game in healthy adult ageing. Exp Aging Res 44(3):246-257. https://doi.org/10.1080/0361073X.2018.1449590

Han SD, Boyle PA, James BD, Yu L, Bennett DA (2015) Mild cognitive impairment is associated with poorer decision-making in community-based older persons. J Am Geriatr Soc 63(4):676-683. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.13346

Harlé KM, Sanfey AG (2012) Social economic decision-making across the lifespan: an fMRI investigation. Neuropsychologia 50(7):1416-1424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.02.026

Henninger DE, Madden DJ, Huettel SA (2010) Processing speed and memory mediate age-related differences in decision making. Psychol Aging 25(2):262-270.

Hess TM, O'Brien EL, Growney CM, Hafer JG (2018) Use of descriptive and experiential information in decision making by young and older adults. Neuropsychol Dev Cogn B Ageing Neuropsychol Cogn 25(4):500-519. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2017.1327014

Hess TM, Queen TL, Patterson TR (2012) To deliberate or not to deliberate: interactions between age, task characteristics, and cognitive activity on decision making. Behav Decis Mak 25(1):29-40.

Huang YH, Wood S, Berger DE, Hanoch Y (2015) Age differences in experiential and deliberative processes in unambiguous and ambiguous decision making. Psychol Aging 30(3):675-687. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000038

James BD, Boyle PA, Bennett JS, Bennett DA (2012) The impact of health and financial literacy on decision making in community-based older adults. Gerontology 58(6):531-539.

James BD, Boyle PA, Yu L, Han SD, Bennett DA (2015) Cognitive decline is associated with risk aversion and temporal discounting in older adults without dementia. PLoS One 10(4):e0121900. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121900

Jimura K, Myerson J, Hilgard J, Keighley J, Braver TS, Green L (2011) Domain independence and stability in young and older adults' discounting of delayed rewards. Behav Processes 87(3):253-259.

Jüni P, Witschi A, Bloch R, Egger M (1999) The hazards of scoring the quality of clinical trials for meta-analysis. JAMA 282(11):1054-1060.

Kahneman D (2003) A perspective on judgment and choice: mapping bounded rationality. Am Psychol 58(9):697-720.

Kim S, Hasher L (2005) The attraction effect in decision making: superior performance by older adults. Q J Exp Psychol A 58(1):120-133.

Koscielniak M, Rydzewska K, Sedek G (2016) Effects of age and initial risk perception on balloon analog risk task: the mediating role of processing speed and need for cognitive closure. Front Psychol 7:659.

Kusev P, Purser H, Heilman R, Cooke AJ, Van Schaik P, Baranova V, Martin R, Ayton P (2017) Understanding Risky Behavior: the influence of cognitive, emotional and hormonal factors on decision-making under risk. Front Psychol 8:102.

Lerner JS, Li Y, Valdesolo P, Kassam KS (2015) Emotion and decision making. Annu Rev Psychol 66:799-823. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115043

Li L, Cazzell M, Zeng L, Liu H (2017) Are there gender differences in young vs. ageing brains under risk decision-making? An optical brain imageing study. Brain Imaging Behav 11(4):1085-1098.

Li Y, Baldassi M, Johnson EJ, Weber EU (2013) Complementary cognitive capabilities, economic decision making, and ageing. Psychol Aging 28(3):595-613.

Li Y, Gao J, Enkavi AZ, Zaval L, Weber EU, Johnson EJ (2015) Sound credit scores and financial decisions despite cognitive ageing. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 112(1):65-69. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1413570112

Lim KT, Yu R (2015) Aging and wisdom: age-related changes in economic and social decision making. Front Ageing Neurosci 7:120. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2015.00120

Lobjois R, Cavallo V (2007) Age-related differences in street-crossing decisions: the effects of vehicle speed and time constraints on gap selection in an estimation task. Accid Anal Prev 39(5):934-943.

Lockenhoff CE, Rutt JL, Samanez-Larkin GR, O'Donoghue T, Reyna VF, Ganzel B (2016) Dread sensitivity in decisions about real and imagined electrical shocks does not vary by age. Psychol Aging 31(8):890-901. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000136

Ma X, Chen Y (2015) Age Differences in Trade-off Decisions: different strategies but similar outcomes. Can J Ageing 34(2):247-256. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0714980815000033

MacPherson SE, Phillips LH, Della Sala S (2002) Age, executive function, and social decision making: a dorsolateral prefrontal theory of cognitive ageing. Psychol Aging 17(4):598-609. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12507357

Mata R, Josef AK, Samanez-Larkin GR, Hertwig R (2011) Age differences in risky choice: a meta-analysis. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1235(1):18-29. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06200.x

Mata R, Schooler LJ, Rieskamp J (2007) The ageing decision maker: cognitive ageing and the adaptive selection of decision strategies. Psychol Aging 22(4):796-810. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.22.4.796

Mata R, von Helversen B, Rieskamp J (2010) Learning to choose: cognitive ageing and strategy selection learning in decision making. Psychol Aging 25(2):299-309. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018923

Mikels A, Cheung E, Cone J, Gilovich T (2013) The dark side of intuition: ageing and increases in nonoptimal intuitive decisions. Emotion 13(2):189-195. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030441

Mikels JA, Löckenhoff CE, Maglio SJ, Carstensen LL, Goldstein MK, Garber A (2010) Following your heart or your head: focusing on emotions versus information

differentially influences the decisions of younger and older adults. J Exp Psychol Appl 16(1):87.

Moye J, Karel MJ, Gurrera RJ, Azar AR (2006) Neuropsychological predictors of decision-making capacity over 9 months in mild-to-moderate dementia. J Gen Intern Med 21(1):78-83. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2005.00288.x

Pachur T, Mata, R, Hertwig R (2017) Who Dares, Who Errs? Disentangling Cognitive and Motivational Roots of Age Differences in Decisions Under Risk. Psychol Sci 28(4):504-518. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616687729

Pachur T, Mata R, Schooler LJ (2009) Cognitive ageing and the adaptive use of recognition in decision making. Psychol Ageing 24(4):901-915. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017211

Pertl MT, Benke T, Zamarian L, Delazer M (2017) Effects of Healthy Ageing and Mild Cognitive Impairment on a Real-Life Decision-Making Task. J Alzheimers Dis 58(4):1077-1087. https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-170119

Peters E, Hess TM, Vastfjall D, Auman C (2007) Adult Age Differences in Dual Information Processes: implications for the role of affective and deliberative processes in older adults' decision making. Perspect Psychol Sci 2(1):1-23. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00025.

Peters E, Hess TM, Västfjäll D, Auman C (2007) Adult age differences in dual information processes: implications for the role of affective and deliberative processes in older adults' decision making. Perspect Psychol Sci 2(1):1-23.

Peterson RA, Brown SP (2005) On the use of beta coefficients in meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology 90(1):175.

Phillips WJ, Fletcher JM, Marks AD, Hin DW (2016) Thinking styles and decision making: a meta-analysis. Psychol Bull 142(3):260.

Queen TL, Hess TM (2010) Age differences in the effects of conscious and unconscious thought in decision making. Psychol Aging 25(2):251-261. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018856

Rieger M, Mata R (2015) On the generality of age differences in social and nonsocial decision making. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci 70(2):202-214. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbt088

Roalf DR, Mitchell SH, Harbaugh WT, Janowsky JS (2012) Risk, reward, and economic decision making in ageing. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci 67(3):289-298. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbr099

Rogalsky C, Vidal C, Li X, Damasio H (2012) Risky decision-making in older adults without cognitive deficits: an fMRI study of VMPFC using the Iowa gambling task. Soc Neurosci 7(2):178-190.

Rolison JJ, Hanoch Y, Wood S (2012) Risky decision making in younger and older adults: the role of learning. Psychol Ageing 27(1):129-140. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024689

Rolison JJ, Wood S, Hanoch Y (2017) Age and Adaptation: stronger decision updating about real world risks in older age. Risk Anal 37(9):1632-1643. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12710

Rosen JB, Brand M, Kalbe E (2016) Empathy Mediates the Effects of Age and Sex on Altruistic Moral Decision Making. Front Behav Neurosci 10:67. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00067

Rupinski MT, Dunlap WP (1996) Approximating Pearson product-moment correlations from Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. Educa Psychol Meas 56(3):419-429.

Rutledge RB, Smittenaar P, Zeidman P, Brown HR, Adams RA, Lindenberger U, Dayan P, Dolan RJ (2016) Risk Taking for Potential Reward Decreases across the Lifespan. Curr Biol 26(12):1634-1639. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.05.017

Rydzewska K, von Helversen B, Kossowska M, Magnuski M, Sedek G (2018) Age-related within-task adaptations in sequential decision making: considering cognitive and motivational factors. Psychol Ageing 33(2):297-314.

Schiebener J, Brand M (2017) Age-related variance in decisions under ambiguity is explained by changes in reasoning, executive functions, and decision-making under risk. Cogn Emot 31(4):816-824. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2016.1159944

Seaman KL, Brooks N, Karrer TM, Castrellon JJ, Perkins SF, Dang LC, Hsu M, Zald DH, Samanez-Larkin GR (2018) Subjective value representations during effort, probability and time discounting across adulthood. Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci 13(5):449-459. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsy021

Seaman KL, Gorlick MA, Vekaria KM, Hsu M, Zald DH, Samanez-Larkin GR (2016) Adult age differences in decision making across domains: increased discounting of social and health-related rewards. Psychol Aging 31(7):737-746. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000131

Sparrow EP, Spaniol J (2018) Ageing and altruism in intertemporal choice. Psychol Ageing 33(2):315-324. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000223

Sterne JA, Egger M (2001) Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis: guidelines on choice of axis. J Clin Epidemiol 54(10):1046-1055.

Stewart CC, Yu L, Wilson RS, Bennett DA, Boyle PA (2018) Correlates of healthcare and financial decision making among older adults without dementia. Health Psychol 37(7):618-626. https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000610

Strough J, Bruine de Bruin W, Parker AM, Karns T, Lemaster P, Pichayayothin N, Delaney R, Stoiko R (2016) What were they thinking? Reducing sunk-cost bias in a life-span sample. Psychol Aging 31(7):724.

Strough J, Bruin WB, Peters E (2015) New perspectives for motivating better decisions in older adults. Front Psychol 6:783.nhttps://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00783

Strough J, Mehta CM, McFall JP, Schuller KL (2008) Are older adults less subject to the sunk-cost fallacy than younger adults? Psychol Sci 19(7):650-652.

Thornton WJ, Dumke HA (2005) Age differences in everyday problem-solving and decision-making effectiveness: a meta-analytic review. Psychol Aging 20(1):85-99. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.20.1.85

Tymula A, Rosenberg Belmaker LA, Ruderman L, Glimcher PW, Levy I (2013) Like cognitive function, decision making across the life span shows profound age-related changes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 110(42):17143-17148.

von Helversen B, Mata R (2012) Losing a dime with a satisfied mind: positive affect predicts less search in sequential decision making. Psychol Aging 27(4) 825-839. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027845

Walker N, Fain B, Fisk AD, McGuire CL (1997) Ageing and decision making: driving-related problem solving. Hum Factors 39(3):438-444. https://doi.org/10.1518/001872097778827188

Wang YX, Ruhe G (2007) The Cognitive Process of Decision Making. International Conference on Cognitive Informatics 1(2):73-85.

Wayde EN, Black SR, Gilpin A (2017) Decision-making quality of younger and older adults in familiar and unfamiliar domains. Neuropsychol Dev Cogn B Ageing Neuropsychol Cogn 24(2):135-157. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2016.1176110

Weissberger GH, Han SD, Yu L, Barnes LL, Lamar M, Bennett DA, Boyle PA (2021) Impact of Early Life Socioeconomic Status on Decision Making in Older Adults Without Dementia. Arch Gerontol Geriatr 95:04432. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2021.104432

Wood S, Busemeyer J, Koling A, Cox CR, Davis H (2005) Older Adults as Adaptive Decision Makers: evidence from the iowa gambling task. Psychol Aging 20(2):220-225.

Wood S, Hanoch Y, Barnes A, Liu PJ, Cummings J, Bhattacharya C, Rice T (2011) Numeracy and Medicare Part D: the importance of choice and literacy for numbers in optimizing decision making for Medicare's prescription drug program. Psychol Aging 26(2):295-307. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022028

Worthy DA, Cooper JA, Byrne KA, Gorlick MA, Maddox WT (2014) State-based versus reward-based motivation in younger and older adults. Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci 14(4):1208-1220. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-014-0293-8

Worthy DA, Davis T, Gorlick MA, Cooper JA, Bakkour A, Mumford JA, Poldrack RA, Maddox WT (2016) Neural correlates of state-based decision-making in younger and older adults. Neuroimage 130:13-23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.12.004

Worthy DA, Gorlick MA, Pacheco JL, Schnyer DM, Maddox WT (2011) With age comes wisdom: decision making in younger and older adults. Psychol Sci 22(11):1375-1380.

Zamarian L, Sinz H, Bonatti E, Gamboz N, Delazer M (2008) Normal ageing affects decisions under ambiguity, but not decisions under risk. Neuropsychology 22(5):645-657. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.22.5.645